

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 15-18, 23, 25 and 30-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 12-14, 19-22, 24 and 26-29 were previously canceled. Claims 30 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-11, 15-18, 23 and 30-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's rejections. The original disclosure on page 15 (lines 1-14) recites "[i]f it is found that ... there is faulty contacting or miscontacting ... the testing apparatus 4 outputs a corresponding fault signal (FAIL signal) which is, for instance, transferred to the loading machine 10. Subsequently, the carrier 11a is made to - automatically open again ... to take the semiconductor device out ...." Hence, Claim 1 does not add new matter.

At page 14, lines 5-15, the original specification discloses "... checking whether a corresponding current flow is caused in reaction to voltages or testing signals, ... a corresponding signal ... is output. In other words, the testing apparatus 4 does not check the - actual - functioning of the device 3a ... but - merely - the correct contacting between the carrier 11a and the device 3a." Clearly, this passage supports claim 11, which states "wherein an amount of voltage dropping across the corresponding semiconductor device contact is determined to find whether electrical contact has been established between the test contact of the semiconductor device and the assigned pad of the carrier."

Page 14, lines 16-22, of the original disclosure recites "... one or a plurality of specific contacts may be provided at the device 3a, which are used for performing the

contact test method explained (not, however, for the - actual - device functioning tests that are, for instance, performed at station D)." Hence, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 30 and 35 are amended to clarify the contacting between the semiconductor device and the carrier. All limitations of these claims are supported in the original specification.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hash (U.S. Patent No. 6,734,683, hereinafter "Hash"). Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hash. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In rejecting claims 1, 30 and 35, Examiner incorrectly fails to give any patentable weight to limitations deemed to be new matter. This approach is wrong as a matter of law. All limitations must be considered in determining patentability. MPEP § 2143.03. Regarding claim 30, Examiner recites "limitation ... is not given any patentable weight." Final Office Action dated February 11, 2008, p. 5. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." MPEP § 2143.03, quoting *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). The Examiner must consider all the limitations of claims 1, 30 and 35.

Claim 1 specifically recites "unloading the semiconductor device from the test carrier based on a criterion, wherein the criterion is based on the electrical coupling between the test carrier and the semiconductor device obtained from the test." Hash does not teach or suggest these limitations. Rather, Hash teaches attaching a test module to a socket. Hash does not teach or even suggest unloading the semiconductor device from

the test carrier based on the electrical coupling between the test carrier and the semiconductor device. Hence, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-11, 15-18, 23 and 25 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 30, as currently amended, specifically recites “a contact tester electrically contacting the carrier, wherein the contact tester tests electrical coupling of the semiconductor device with the carrier” and “a functional tester physically separated from the contact tester.” Neither of these limitations is taught or suggested by the prior art. In particular, Hash does not teach two different testers – a functional tester and a contact tester. Hence independent claim 30 is allowable.

Claims 31-34 depend from claim 30 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 35, as currently amended, specifically recites “unloading semiconductor devices with defective electrical connections between the semiconductor device and the carrier from the carrier.” As discussed with respect to claim 1, this limitation is not taught or suggested by Hash. Hence, claim 35 is allowable.


Claims 36-39 depend from claim 35 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, in the event that there are any fees due, please charge the same, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

4/11/08

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Ira S. Matsil  
Reg. No. 35,272  
Attorney for Applicant

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, TX 75252  
Tel: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218